

APPENDIX A – 9

Air Quality Conformity Analysis MTC Resolution No. 3487

Date: January 22, 2003
W.I.: 1512
Referred by: PAC

ABSTRACT

Resolution No. 3487

This resolution finds that the proposed 2003 Transportation Improvement Program is in conformance with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) to achieve National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

Date: January 22, 2003
W.I.: 1512
Referred by: PAC

RE: Approval of the Air Quality Conformity of the 2003 Transportation Improvement Program to the State Implementation Plan for Achieving and Maintaining National Ambient Air Quality Standards

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. 3487

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the regional transportation planning agency for the San Francisco Bay Area pursuant to Government Code Section 66500 et seq.; and

WHEREAS, MTC is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area region (the region); and

WHEREAS, MTC has developed, in cooperation with the State, operators of publicly-owned mass transportation systems, and appropriate local government officials, the 2003 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), based on regional priorities; and

WHEREAS, the 2003 TIP is scheduled for approval on January 22, 2003 (MTC Resolution No. 3500) upon the approval of this resolution; and

WHEREAS, MTC has conducted a transportation air quality conformity analysis for the 2003 TIP, in accordance with the Bay Area air quality conformity procedures (MTC Resolutions Nos. 2730 and 3075) adopted pursuant to Environmental Protection Agency regulations; and

WHEREAS, said conformity analysis is included as Attachment A of this resolution, and is incorporated herein as though set forth at length; and

WHEREAS, the conformity analysis has been circulated for public comment; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that MTC finds the proposed 2003 TIP, as set forth in MTC Resolution No. 3500, conforms to the applicable provisions of the State Implementation Plan, including the motor vehicle emissions budget contained in the 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan, and therefore be it

RESOLVED, that Executive Director shall forward a copy of this Resolution to those agencies receiving a copy of MTC Resolution No. 3500.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Sharon J. Brown, Chair

The above resolution was entered into by the
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
at a regular meeting of the Commission held
in Oakland, California, on January 22, 2003.

Date: January 22, 2003
W.I.: 1512
Referred by: PAC

Attachment A
Resolution No. 3487
Page 1 of 16

**Transportation Air Quality Conformity Analysis
for the 2003 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Transportation Air Quality Conformity Analysis

for the
2003 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

January 2003

Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter • 101 Eighth Street • Oakland, CA 94607-4700
510/464-7700 • FAX: 510/464-7848 • TTY: 510/464-7769
www.mtc.ca.gov

Contents

Conformity Analysis

I.	Summary of Conformity Analysis	1
II.	Response to Public Comments	3
III.	Conformity Findings	10

Conformity Analysis of the 2003 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

I. Summary of Conformity Analysis

Since the 2003 TIP does not include any new regionally significant projects beyond those currently included in the 2001 RTP, and these projects have been modeled in the appropriate horizon year using the latest planning assumptions, MTC is using the conformity analysis for the 2001 RTP and 2001 TIP, as amended through Amendment 01-32. The latest conformity analysis is included in the report “*Final Transportation Air Quality Conformity Analysis for 2001 RTP and FY 2001 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment 01-32*”, hereinafter referred to as the Conformity Report. FTA and FHWA approved MTC’s conformity determination on March 18, 2002.

For purposes of the conformity analyses, we state for the record:

1. Latest Planning Assumptions, Emissions Model and Budget Comparison. No new regional emission analysis was necessary for this conformity determination. As stated above, this conformity determination is based on the regional emissions analysis performed for the 2001 RTP. Please refer to the above referenced conformity report for the details of this analysis.
2. TCM Implementation. Subsequent to the March 18 conformity approval by US DOT, the Federal District Court issued an Order Granting Injunctive Relief relative to the implementation of TCM 2. While MTC has decided to appeal the TCM 2 decision, MTC will meet the requirements of the Order in a timely manner during the pendency of an appeal. MTC is required to file quarterly progress reports on progress made in complying with the Order. MTC’s first report was filed prior to the due date of November 9, 2002 and included regional ridership statistics for Fiscal Year 2001/2002. Also, as required by the Order, MTC prepared and adopted an Amendment to the 2001 RTP in November 2002 describing how full implementation of TCM 2 will be achieved. This Amendment describes how the programs and projects in the RTP will achieve the TCM 2 transit ridership target for 2006 and does not add or delete projects, change the project scope, or alter the timing of any project

in the 2001 RTP. All other information on the timely implementation of TCMs in the previous conformity analysis (referenced above) is still current.

3. Reliance on the Previous Regional Emissions Analysis. Since the conformity determination for the 2003 TIP relies on the previous regional emissions analysis, MTC is required to meet the requirements of CFR §93.122(e), which are as follows:

(e) Reliance on previous regional emissions analysis.

(1) The TIP may be demonstrated to satisfy the requirements of §§93.118 ("Motor vehicle emissions budget") or 93.119 ("Emission reductions in areas without motor vehicle emissions budgets") without new regional emissions analysis if the regional emissions analysis already performed for the plan also applies to the TIP. This requires a demonstration that:

(i) The TIP contains all projects, which must be started in the TIP's timeframe in order to achieve the highway and transit system envisioned by the transportation plan;

(ii) All TIP projects which are regionally significant are included in the transportation plan with design concept and scope adequate to determine their contribution to the transportation plan's regional emissions at the time of the transportation plan's conformity determination; and

(iii) The design concept and scope of each regionally significant project in the TIP is not significantly different from that described in the transportation plan.

(2) A project which is not from a conforming transportation plan and a conforming TIP may be demonstrated to satisfy the requirements of §§93.118 or 93.119 without additional regional emissions analysis if allocating funds to the project will not delay the implementation of projects in the transportation plan or TIP which are necessary to achieve the highway and transit system envisioned by the transportation plan, and if the project is either:

(i) Not regionally significant; or

(ii) Included in the conforming transportation plan (even if it is not specifically included in the latest conforming TIP) with design concept and scope adequate to determine its contribution to the transportation plan's regional emissions at the time of the transportation plan's conformity determination, and the design concept and scope of the project is not significantly different from that described in the transportation plan.

The 2003 TIP meets these requirements:

- The TIP contains all projects, which must be started in the TIP's timeframe in order to achieve the highway and transit system envisioned by the transportation plan.
- All TIP projects which are regionally significant are included in the 2001 *Regional Transportation Plan* (RTP) and have a design concept and scope adequate to determine their contribution to the RTP's regional emissions at the time of the transportation plan's conformity determination.
- The design concept and scope of each regionally significant project in the TIP is not significantly different from those described in the RTP.
- All projects in the 2003 TIP are from a conforming RTP. Allocating funds to

these projects will not delay the implementation of projects in the RTP or TIP, which are necessary to achieve the highway and transit system envisioned by the RTP.

4. Financial Constraint. The 2003 TIP is financially constrained based on revenue estimates from the State at the time of its preparation. The 2003 TIP covers the three fiscal years FY 2002-03 through FY 2004-05. The 2003 TIP only includes one year of federal funding for STP, CMAQ, and TEA, which is the last year of the TEA 21 authorization period. MTC has not made any assumptions about post TEA 21 funding, due to uncertainty over future funding levels that Congress will authorize in “TEA 3”. The impact of potential state budget problems on specific projects and programs in the TIP is unknown at this time. State legislative action will be required to address these problems, which has not occurred.
5. Interagency and Public Consultation. The prior regional conformity analysis leading to FHWA and FTA’s approval in March 2002 underwent extensive agency and public consultation as documented in the conformity report. A Draft 2003 TIP was first circulated in May 2002, and the conformity determination for the 2003 TIP was discussed with the Partnership’s Air Quality Conformity Task Force on June 18, 2002. However, due to an order issued by the federal Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit staying EPA’s approval of the motor vehicle emission budget for the Bay Area’s SIP, MTC could not adopt the TIP in July as planned. MTC subsequently adopted an Interim TIP on October 23, 2002 consisting primarily of exempt projects. The stay on EPA’s approval of the budget was lifted on December 24, 2002 allowing MTC to adopt the complete 2003 TIP. The conformity determination for the 2003 TIP was again discussed with the Conformity Task Force in December 2002. Both the initial draft 2003 TIP and the December 2002 draft TIP and associated conformity determinations were subject to a 30 day public comment period and a public hearing.

II. Response to Public Comments

Responses to public comments below include responses to both the initial set of comments received on the May 2002 Draft 2003 TIP and the second set of comments received on the Draft 2003 TIP released in December 2002. Comments on the conformity analysis come from several sources:

- 1) Comments submitted in response to the May 2002 Draft TIP (3 letters)
- 2) Two public hearings—one on the initial 2003 Draft TIP and a second one on January 8, 2003 for the revised 2003 Draft TIP
- 3) Oral comments at the December 9, 2002 Air Quality Conformity Task Force meeting
- 4) Written comments on the 2003 Draft TIP released in December 2002 (one letter).

Copies of the letters received are included in Appendix A.

Responses to Comments on Conformity Analysis for Draft 2003 TIP issued in May 2002

Use of Previous Regional Emissions Analysis for 2001 RTP

Comment: MTC cannot rely on the existing regional emissions analysis for the 2001 RTP and TIP Amendment 01-32.

Response: The most recent regional emissions analysis for the 2001 RTP/TIP and TIP Amendment 01-32 was approved by FHWA/FTA on March 18, 2002. Since the 2003 TIP does not include any new regionally significant projects beyond those currently included in the 2001 RTP, and all other requirements of 40 CFR 93.122 (e)(i-iii) are met, MTC is using the prior regional emissions analysis. The new non exempt projects that are being added to the 2003 TIP from the conformed 2001 RTP are shown in Appendix B along with their RTP Reference Numbers.

Reliance on Conformity Procedures that have not yet been approved

Comment: MTC cannot make a conformity finding because EPA has not approved the latest MTC conformity SIP revisions from 1998.

Response. The fact that EPA has not approved MTC's latest amendments to the conformity SIP (MTC Resolution No. 3075), does not interfere with a conformity finding for the 2003 TIP.

MTC initially adopted a set of conformity procedures that included EPA's original conformity regulations in 1994 (MTC Resolution No. 2730). These procedures were approved by EPA. Both the EPA's November 24, 1993, Transportation Conformity Rule and the August 15, 1997, Transportation Conformity Rule identify procedures that can be used to demonstrate conformity of a transportation improvement program without additional regional emissions analysis. These procedures can be found in 40 CFR 93.119(b) of the 1993 Transportation Conformity Rule and 40 CFR 93.122(e) of the 1997 Transportation Conformity Rule. As part of this conformity determination, MTC has demonstrated that the requirements 40 CFR 93.122(e)(i-iii), from the 1997 Transportation Conformity Rule, have been met. These requirements are consistent with the requirements of the 40 CFR 93.119(b)(2)(i-iii), from the 1993 Transportation Conformity Rule. Therefore, under either set of regulations, MTC can rely on the previous regional emissions analysis from the conforming Regional Transportation Plan as part of the conformity determination for the 2003TIP.

Use of the Latest Planning Assumptions

Comment: The transit assumptions are no longer valid, and a complete new forecast is required for the regional emissions analysis.

Response: The joint Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration guidance, *Use of Latest Planning Assumptions in Conformity Determinations* issued on January 18, 2001, states that MPOs can rely on a previous regional emissions analysis if the requirements of 40 CFR 93.122(e) are met, *even if planning assumptions have changed.*

In addition to the above guidance, which clearly permits use of the previous regional emissions analysis, there are other related considerations that suggest that new travel forecasts would not be accurate or useful in a conformity analysis.

- 1) Forecasting assumptions are in a constant state of flux. As noted in responses to comments in the *Final Transportation Air Quality Conformity Analysis for 2001 RTP and FY 2001 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment 01-32* (February 2002), preparing forecasts during periods of rapid change in economic or travel conditions does not engender great confidence in the results (see Response E1).
- 2) It is not possible to simply modify one part of the forecasts, such as transit fares and routes, when even more influential forecasting variables are not adjusted, such as future job projections. MTC does not have any new projections from ABAG that would account for recent changes in the job climate.
- 3) A new “mid-course review” SIP is being developed which will use the latest planning assumptions, and this is the most appropriate venue for expending resources to integrate revised travel forecasts into the SIP planning process.
- 4) If, from a hypothetical standpoint, travel forecasts could be revised based on the most recent events, it is likely that the motor vehicle emissions forecasts would be lower due to the loss of jobs and corresponding impact on regional traffic (the fact that there is less traffic on the freeway system is clearly shown in Caltrans latest congestion monitoring report).

TCM Issues

Comment: Lack of timely implementation of TCM 2 prevents a conformity finding

Response: Emission reductions from TCM 2 were achieved in a timely manner by virtue of the increase in transit ridership that has occurred since 1982/83 and the Contingency TCMs adopted by MTC in the early 90’s. The finding that MTC has a separate obligation in the 1982 SIP to achieve a transit ridership target was only recently established in a Federal District Court Order Granting Injunctive Relief (which MTC has appealed to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals), and this Order describes certain activities MTC must undertake between now and 2006. MTC will comply with these requirements according to the schedule in the Order during the pendency of the appeal.

Comment: The TIP interferes with Transportation Control Measure 2

Response: Several letters assert that the TIP includes transit projects that “will result in either no short-term increase in transit ridership or a decrease ridership, rather than funding the less expensive projects that can be carried out more rapidly.” This comment is both unproven and inconsistent with the analysis in the RTP and the Court-ordered RTP Amendment that shows there will be significant transit capacity increases and associated ridership gains under the 2001 RTP, as adopted.

Comment: Failure to implement transit plans developed by AC Transit and Muni for their settlement agreement with Bay View Hunters Point et. al. would interfere with TCM 2 implementation.

Response: Transit ridership growth is projected to occur as result of projects that are

already included in the RTP and TIP. The above referenced agreements pertain to obligations of the individual transit operators and not MTC.

Comment: Failure to document TCM assumptions for new TCMs A-E; emission reductions from new TCMs were not estimated by reasonably professional methods.

Response: These comments were previously responded to in the earlier conformity report and are more relevant to EPA's review of the 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan.

TCM A (Regional Express Bus)- Several letters allege that TCM A emission credits are double counted. This is incorrect as noted in Response G2 of the February 2002 Conformity Report.

TCM E (Airport transit)-Several letters contend that the emission reductions associated with air passenger trips on the BART extension to the San Francisco International Airport are improperly calculated. Comment G3 from the February 2002 Conformity Report explains the basis for the emission credits taken.

Comment: Questions about implementation status of five new TCMs

Response: All the TCMs are proceeding on schedule as envisioned in the 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan. In the near term, the Regional Express Bus (TCM A) is fully funded and the buses have been ordered, Freeway Service Patrol (TCM D) has been deployed, and the BART extension to the San Francisco Airport is scheduled to open in early 2003. Other TCMs are not scheduled to begin until 2003.

Comment: No credit can be taken for MS-1 (Smog Check enhancements) since implementation has not taken place.

Response: Implementation is scheduled by CARB for 2002-2003, as indicated in the SIP. Emission reductions will be in place by the 2006 attainment year. Regarding legal authority, the Air District has the authority to request the State Bureau of Automotive Repair (BAR) to implement portions of the Enhanced Inspection and Maintenance program in the Bay Area (Health and Safety Code Section 44003 c (2)). The BAR has the authority to implement the Inspection and Maintenance program (Health and Safety Code 44001.5). It should be further noted that recent Smog Check II legislation signed by the Governor (AB 2636, Cardoza) would provide emission reductions that greatly exceed the MS-1 amounts.

Carbon Monoxide Analysis

Comment: Failure to use EPA-approved emission model and use appropriate model years.

Response: The CO analysis was discussed in the previous Conformity Report. In addition, FHWA responded in detail to this issue in an April 22, 2002 letter to Mr. Marc Chytilo:

“We have determined that MTC complied with 23 CFR 450.31 (b) and that the process is consistent with the San Francisco Bay Area Conformity SIP approved

by EPA in 1997. MTC conservatively modeled CO emissions using both EMFAC7F and EMFAC 2000 for the conformity determination. EMFAC 7F was the emissions model used in the CO Maintenance Plan, and it is the model currently approved by EPA for CO analysis in the San Francisco Bay Area. EMFAC2000 includes the latest planning assumptions, but only for the 2010 analysis year. Using EMFAC7F for all analysis years and EMFAC2000 for the 2010 analysis year, MTC demonstrated, consistency with the requirements of 40 CFR 93.109 and 92.118 that projected CO emissions were considerably lower than the current CO motor vehicle emissions budget.”

Comment: Failure to demonstrate CO conformity for all required years

Response: See above response.

Comment: VMT for CO analysis was not adjusted to match CARB VMT

Response: Both CARB (EMFAC 2000) and MTC (EMFAC 7F) have agreed on the regional VMT numbers for 2000 and 2006 and have used the same procedures for adjusting VMT in the out years beyond 2006.

Comment: Incorrect temperature assumptions were used.

Response: Both CARB’s and MTC’s analysis of CO emissions use winter temperatures.

Comment: TCM 12 (from the 1982 federal air quality plan) is not being implemented in a timely manner.

Response: TCM 12 refers to the Commute Alternatives Program for San Jose that was a carbon monoxide (CO) control strategy. All of the core programs envisioned in the early 80’s continue to implemented in various aspects today. The Bay Area has a long record of CO attainment in downtown San Jose and elsewhere in the region.

Travel Model Issues

Comment: Failure to account for visitor-related travel

Response: While there is no visitor/tourist trip purpose model per se (as it is not feasible in development of regional travel models to have a separate model algorithm for each and every conceivable trip purpose), MTC’s travel demand model accounts for this type of travel in the non-home based trip purpose and in inter regional trips. Essentially non-home based trips are factored up in the model validation process to match daily vehicle and transit trips. These trips and VMT are further factored up to be consistent with CARB’s –higher estimate of regional VMT in the SIP. Thus all VMT in the region is accounted for and may even be overstated, since MTC projects less VMT than CARB.

Comment: MTC’s analysis is based on different VMT and VMT speed data than in the SIP.

Response: This statement is incorrect. The prior conformity analysis for the 2001 RTP uses the same VMT/speed distribution numbers as the 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan.

Misallocation of funds in the TIP

Comment: The TIP misdirects funds to air pollution generating highway projects.

Response: Only 13% of the TIP funding is for highway and local road expansion. Further, the motor vehicle emission budget assumes these projects are implemented and their effects are accounted for in the budget. Since the regional emissions analysis shows the motor vehicle emissions budget is met with all the projects in the TIP, it is incorrect to conclude that highway projects interfere with attainment.

Comment: MTC has not honored commitments made to the Air Quality Conformity Task Force.

Response: MTC has provided information to the Task Force and individual members that is reasonably available and necessary for an informed public decision. MTC may have a different opinion about the nature of commitments that were made compared to those of individual Task Force participants.

Responses to Comments Received on the Conformity Analysis for the 2003 Draft TIP Released in December 2002

Reliance on Previous Regional Emissions Analysis

Comment. To rely on the previous regional emissions analysis, MTC must specifically address each component of Section 93.122(e) in the conformity regulations as opposed to making summary findings.

Response. The summary conclusions are appropriate. In simple language, MTC has modeled all TIP projects in the appropriate horizon year, either 2005 or 2010 for estimation of motor vehicle emissions, and the definition of the projects in the transportation network used to model travel behavior and regional emissions has not changed from the last conformity analysis for the 2001 RTP. MTC maintains files used in the modeling of the transportation network to support these statements.

MTC's Conformity Procedures

Comment. The TIP adoption cites Resolution No. 3075 as adopting MTC's conformity procedures, the latest revisions of which have not been approved by the EPA.

Response. MTC has revised the TIP adopting resolutions to refer to both Resolution No. 2730 and Resolution No. 3075. Resolution 2730 was the earlier conformity procedures adopted by MTC in 1994 and approved by EPA which are still applicable and which enable MTC to use the prior RTP regional emissions analysis for the 2003 TIP conformity finding.

Impacts of CEQA Lawsuit

Comment. MTC should notify project sponsors that the TIP may be invalidated by an adverse ruling in a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) case in state court alleging the Air District should have prepared a full EIR for the 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan, thus invalidating the SIP.

Response. Project sponsors have been advised that there is pending litigation over the

CEQA review of the 2001 SIP. We cannot speculate as to the outcome of this litigation.

Latest Motor Vehicle Emission Budget Challenge

Comment. Due to the petition by Plaintiffs for rehearing of the adequacy of the motor vehicle emission budget in Federal Court, the budgets may still be found inadequate, invalidating the TIP.

Response. The success of the Plaintiffs in achieving a rehearing is not known; however, if the TIP has already been approved, the projects in the approved TIP could proceed.

TCM 2 and the November 2002 RTP Amendment

Comment. The RTP Amendment is unlikely to lead to the achievement of the transit target for TCM 2, and thus could invalidate the conformity finding.

Response. See earlier responses on TCM 2. The Court Order does not link the TCM 2 ridership to the conformity process, rather it is a separate SIP obligation of MTC. The target date is 2006. Thus, in terms of the conformity process, the main criteria is whether MTC is complying with the administrative requirements of the Order itself, which as indicated previously, MTC has. Comments that MTC's RTP and the latest RTP Amendment interfere with the regional ridership target are unsubstantiated.

Comment. MTC cannot demonstrate timely implementation of TCM 2 if there are significant shortfalls in transit operator budgets, including such projects as for the regional express bus program.

Response. See response above. Also, MTC has taken necessary and appropriate steps to help transit operators sustain their existing service until the economic recovery begins and their operating revenues begin to increase again. As we have stated in the past, initial service cuts will focus on the less productive routes with lower ridership, therefore their impact on overall regional ridership potential should not be significant.

Smog Check II and Motor Vehicle Emissions Budget

Comment (from December 2003 Conformity Task Force Meeting). The Motor Vehicle Emission Budget needs to be modified now through a SIP revision to address the passage of Smog Check II legislation for the Bay Area.

Response. The details of the Smog Check program planned for the Bay Area have not been fully developed. Further, SIP revisions occur when there are scheduled updates. The next update is the mid-course review called for in the 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan. Work on this update will begin in 2003 and will be completed by April 2004.

III. Conformity Findings

Based on the previous referenced analysis, the following findings are made:

- This transportation air quality conformity analysis was conducted consistent with EPA's regulations and with the Bay Area Air Quality Conformity Procedures adopted by MTC in Resolutions No. 2730 and Resolution No. 3075.
- The 2003 TIP provides for implementation of TCMs pursuant to the following federal regulation:

(1) An examination of the specific steps and funding source(s) needed to fully implement each TCM indicates that TCMs which are eligible for funding under title 23 U.S.C. or the Federal Transit Laws are on or ahead of the schedule established in the applicable implementation plan, or, if such TCMs are behind the schedule established in the applicable implementation plan, the MPO and DOT have determined that past obstacles to implementation of the TCMs have been identified and have been or are being overcome, and that all State and local agencies with influence over approvals or funding for TCMs are giving maximum priority to approval or funding to TCMs over other projects within their control, including projects in locations outside the non-attainment or maintenance area.

(2) If TCMs in the applicable implementation plan have previously been programmed for Federal funding but the funds have not been obligated and the TCMs are behind the schedule in the implementation plan, then the TIP cannot be found to conform if the funds intended for those TCMs are reallocated to projects in the TIP other than TCMs, or if there are no other TCMs in the TIP, if the funds are reallocated to projects in the TIP other than projects which are eligible for Federal funding intended for air quality improvements projects, e.g., the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program.

(3) Nothing in the TIP may interfere with the implementation of any TCM in the applicable implementation plan. (40 CFR Part 93.113(c)).

- MTC's 2003 TIP conforms with the 1982 Bay Area Air Quality Plan (applicable State Implementation Plan) as augmented and amended by the 1994 Ozone Maintenance Plan, and partial approval/partial disapproval of the 1999 Ozone Attainment Plan. The 2003 TIP also conforms to the CO Maintenance Plan.

Appendix A

Public Comment Letters

Public comment letters are on view at the offices of the
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
as part of MTC Resolution No. 3487

Appendix B

NEW NON-EXEMPT PROJECTS IN THE REVISED 2003 TIP (not in the 2001 TIP)

	TIP ID		Project Name	N/E	MODE	Project Type	Fund Source	Amount
1	ALA010053	21121	Thornton Avenue Widening - Btw Gateway & Hickory St.	N	Local Hwy	Capital Project	RTIP	\$ 679,000
2	ALA030005	21469	Las Positas Road Connection	N	Local Hwy	Capital Expansion	Other Local	\$ 2,600,000
3	CC-030001	21208	Richmond Parkway Transit Center Parking	N	Transit	Capital Expansion	RTIP	\$ 9,200,000
4	CC-030002	21210	Hercules Train Station Project	N	Transit	Capital Expansion	RTIP/TCRP	\$ 6,000,000
5	CC-030003	98197	BART Richmond Station Additional Parking	N	Transit	Capital Expansion	RTIP/TCRP	\$ 8,800,000
6	CC-030004	21207	Martinez Intermodal Project - Phase 3	N	Transit	Transit Expansion	RTIP	\$ 2,000,000
7	SCL030001	94009	US 101 Auxiliary Lane from SR 87 to Trimble Rd.	N	State Hwy	Capital Expansion	RTIP/TCRP	\$ 24,300,000
8	SCL030006	21785	US 101/Blossom Hill Rd Interchange Reconstruction & Widening	N	State Hwy	Capital Expansion	Local funds	\$ 6,709,000
9	SF-030001	21301	GGBHTD San Francisco Ferry Lay Berth	N	Transit	Capital Expansion	RTIP	\$ 1,655,000
10	SM-030001	21608	SR 101 Auxiliary Lanes - From Santa Clara County Line to Marsh Rd.	N	State Hwy	Capital Expansion	RTIP/Other Local	\$ 40,556,400
11	SOL030002	21981	Fairfield/Vacaville Rail Station	N	Transit	Transit Expansion	RTIP	\$ 4,575,000
12	SOL030003	94138	I-80/I-680/SR12 Interchange/Connector Ph 2	N	State Hwy	Capital Expansion	RTIP/TCRP	\$ 14,735,000

Total \$121,809,400